

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 13-15 are pending in the application. Claims 10-12 were canceled as being drawn to a non-elected species.

The specification was objected to for lack of a descriptive title. Applicant hereby amends the title to be more descriptive.

Claims 1-9 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indistinct. Applicant has amended claim 1 to eliminate the method step and amended the remaining claims to claim a multi-grip blind rivet rather than a combination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gossman. Claim 1 is amended to recite "non-annular, non-secant shaped" indentations. Gossman's indentations are secant-shaped and, therefore, Gossman cannot anticipate the claim, as amended. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).


Claims 2-9 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gossman in view of Lacey. Claims 2-9 and 13-15 require non-annular and non-secant shaped indentations. Gossman's indentations are secant-shaped. Lacey fails to show indentations, instead teaching annular grooves and, thus, does not help overcome Gossman's basic shortcoming. Accordingly, applicant submits that the claims patentably distinguish over Gossman in view of Lacey and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 2-9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

4/9/2003

By: _____


Richard J. Veltman
Reg. No. 36,957